

*Proletarian  
Era*

# 28th ANNIVERSARY SPECIAL



- MECHANICAL THOUGHT PROCESS IN INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT ● CHARACTERISATION OF THE EPOCH, LAW OF INEVITABILITY OF WAR ● RESURGENT NATIONALISM ● REVOLUTIONARY SIGNIFICANCE OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE ● QUESTION OF PEACEFUL TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM
- CULT OF THE INDIVIDUAL ● COMMUNIST UNITY



***Proletarian Era***

( Fortnightly )

Organ of  
Socialist Unity Centre of India

Special Issue

On the occasion of  
28th Anniversary  
of SUCI

Vol.—9, No. 16

15th April, Thursday, 1976

*Editor-in-Chief*—Shibdas Ghosh

Price—60 Paise

We are already committed to our readers to devote this issue entirely on the collections from the pages of the past works of our Party on some vital questions showing how correct they were and how they still hold good to-day. This, we have chosen to do on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of our party, so that the members, supporters, sympathisers and the people at large can judge for themselves the correctness of our stand and see the only redeeming feature and the ray of hope before them through none but our party, the Socialist Unity Centre of India, under the leadership of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, an eminent Marxist thinker of the present era and our beloved leader and teacher.

In the last issue we mainly dealt on, in this feature, the deepening of crisis in world capitalist system and on Fascism with a passing reference to the probable shift in the US imperialist policy from war manoeuvre to peace manoeuvre which was predicted by Comrade Ghosh even before the US Administration declared its policy to normalise relations with People's Republic of China giving up its old policy of containment of China.

From what has already been said in the last issue it is crystal clear that in the third phase of the world crisis of capitalism it is sure to plunge itself into one crisis after another with no hope of its survival losing even the relative stability of capitalist market which it enjoyed before the Second World War. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh highlighted this point before us very clearly. It is only Comrade Ghosh who has been able to thoroughly expose the real nature of fascism—how dangerous and deceptive it is, being

even more dangerous than military dictatorship in so far as it strives to achieve national unity in favour of the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary proletariat under the cover of pseudo radical slogans, social democratic planning and all that in its attempt to win over popular support behind its back and to isolate the genuine revolutionary forces from the masses. It had been our experience that failure to correctly ascertain the real nature of fascism by the communists made it possible for the emergence of Mussolini and Hitler in Italy and Germany respectively in spite of the presence of a mighty working class organisation in both these countries. Judged from that point of view the analysis of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh on fascism is a valuable guide to all communists of the world who are engaged today in fighting fascism which is manifesting itself in diverse forms at the present condition of extreme polarisation of class forces in the international arena.

We are sorry that in the last issue a portion of analysis on fascism was published under a different heading, i.e. shift in the US imperialist policy from war manoeuvre to peace manoeuvre which caused serious inconvenience to our readers. This is highly regretted.

In the present issue we will discuss the following points:

(i) On mechanisation of thought process

in the International Communist Movement; (ii) On characterisation of the present epoch, law of inevitability of war etc., (iii) Role of resurgent nationalism; (iv) Revolutionary significance of the policy of Peaceful Co-existence; (v) On the question of peaceful transition to socialism, (vi) Cult of the individual and (vii) On Communist unity.

We admit that this collection is not an exhaustive one. We have selected only a few very important articles and made free translation of a few speeches of Comrade Ghosh for our reference leaving aside a vast number of other articles and speeches on the same subjects which could not be accommodated for want of space.

We would like to remind our readers that Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader and teacher and an eminent Marxist thinker of the era was the first to point out the serious danger that lay in the mechanical process of thinking in the International Communist Movement and analysed thoroughly the underlying reasons as far back as in 1948.

It was Comrade Ghosh again who alone on behalf of our Party struck a serious note of caution after analysing the Report of 20th Party Congress of CPSU by holding that: "It will open the flood-gate of revisionism," in May 1956 when all other communist parties in the

world were hailing the report by holding that it would "illumine the path".

However, we have concentrated on a few such important issues. Nevertheless, the present collection, we hope will be very much useful to our readers to show how our party and our party alone gave repeated and serious warnings long ago on a number of vital issues confronting International Communist Movement and how we fulfilled our international obligation as Communists. It will further bring to the fore two very important points. First, that our party as a real revolutionary working class party, in the very process of organising revolution in our country has been able to concretise and further elaborate the general principles of revolutionary ideology of the proletariat—Marxism-Leninism and enrich it through the thoughts of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, an eminent Marxist thinker of the era, General Secretary of our party, our beloved leader and teacher. Secondly, the very fact that had our analyses been heeded in time and necessary steps taken not only to eradicate the mechanisation of thought process in the International Communist Movement but also to rectify other serious blunders and mistakes—then the World Communist Movement could have been saved from the impasse from which it is suffering

at present. Our beloved leader and teacher Comrade Shibdas Ghosh did not hesitate for a single moment to raise his critical note of caution and warning to the leaders of the International Communist Movement when the prevailing psychology that dominated the communist movement was that "To disagree with CPSU means treason and whoever does it cannot remain any more a communist."

History has proved the falsity of such notion and confirmed our analysis that the nature of relationship between a leader and the rank and file members and for that matter between a leading party and other communist parties should never be mechanical, rather it should be always dialectical, permitting interaction and conflict of thought based on the common ground for cementing the unity of the International Communist Camp which is of utmost importance at the present juncture. Had the present leaders of International Communist Movement been guided by the Leninist attitude of trying to know truth from a genuine revolutionary party, however small it may be, then they would have surely taken serious care to know the analysis of Comrade Ghosh on all these vital questions and come forward to get rid of this crisis. If the present collection can help even a bit in this direction, we would consider it a great success.

—Editorial Board, Proletarian Era.

## IN THE THOUGHTS OF COMRADE SHIBDAS GHOSH

# OUR PARTY HAS BEEN ABLE TO CONCRETISE, ELABORATE AND ENRICH THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM-LENINISM

1

# ON MECHANICAL THOUGHT PROCESS IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The release of unprecedented mass struggles and progressive democratic movements throughout the world for lasting peace, democracy and socialism under the leadership of the USSR and the People's Democratic countries of Europe against world imperialism and all sorts of reaction in each and every country have no doubt, struck terror into the capitalist-imperialist camp in the post-war period. But paradoxically enough, there is still lack of firm solidarity on the basis of ideology and uniformity of thinking in the united revolutionary front of the people fighting for the above objective. The danger which is fraught in it cannot be averted by ignoring and glossing over it or by remaining blind to it. Though all the communists know this tautologically, yet in practice, the attitude towards different fraternal socialist countries as recently displayed by the leadership of the World Communist Camp have reflected bossism and in some cases, have become meaninglessly harsh on the plea of enforcing iron discipline. From all this it appears that instead of overcoming the present crisis of the world communist camp, the approach and attitude of the present leadership would presumably push the present situation to a further deeper crisis in near future.

While acknowledging beneficial relationship, with just pride and deference the very many achievements and successes and glorious sacrifices of the world communist movement, we have not fallen back upon even for a moment, to observe certain serious short-comings in it. All the genuine communists who do not want to be swayed away by self-deception in the name of self-criticism and want to adopt a revolutionary programme of action to get rid of the crisis with the help of scientific process of analysis, instead of being influenced by any sort of blind emotion or bias, cannot gloss over these serious short-comings and will have to scientifically probe deep into it.

These serious short-comings and defects are largely due to the fact that the present leadership of the World Communist Camp is, to a very large extent, influenced by mechanical process of thinking. We have been noticing this for a long time with much agony and anxiety. In our opinion, it is precisely because of this that there has been a continuous violation of the Marxist dialectical principle of mutually dependant and

of revolution has developed.

This has virtually led to the negation of conflict of ideas in the matter of developing the concept of 'International leadership'. The result was obviously disastrous on the communist parties of the different countries. That is to say, where the leadership of the communist parties should have been developed along the path of dialectical development through struggle and interaction of ideas between all the members of the party, between the leaders and the rank and file and through deriving knowledge from different kinds of experiences of the world communist movement - most of the parties have chosen the easy way of mechanical centralisation which has led to the formation of the bu-

tries], that in conducting day to day struggles they have been guided by wrong approach and non-proletarian class outlook, in spite of making big strides in the trade union movements in the post-world war period.

It is for this very setback in the ideological sphere of activities that even after arriving at a crucial and important stage of revolutionary struggle when the parties which are to prepare themselves for a fight to finish, have had to adopt afresh a programme to start ideological struggle inside the parties, in this decisive hour too.

The question naturally arises, what is this struggle for and against whom inside the party is this struggle directed? Does the decision to launch the struggle indicate in any way the recognition of the necessity of and correct understanding about developing dialectical process of thinking within the party? In our view, herein lies the crux

parties it would be impossible for them to provide proper leadership to conduct future movement. For, the present leadership of the communist movement has at long last come to realize that the vast organisations that have grown through limitless sufferings and sacrifices made by the workers more or less blindly, without a clear understanding of the objective, are to a large extent devoid of any real foundation, as a result of which, opponent forces (liberal democrats and social democrats who were partners in Democratic Front) are finding it possible to usurp the entire fruit of it. This explains why attempts are being made afresh to undertake ideological struggles in order to translate the knowledge of science of Marxism into collective knowledge of the parties. But, here too, the manner in which criticism and self criticism is being conducted, the way in which a policy of sheer one-sided analysis and mechanical approach to problems is being followed, denying any opportunity to the teachings, past as well as present, of the communist movement to come into conflict and contradiction with opposing ideas and view-points or even deliberately glossing over it altogether, and unquestioning blind acceptance of the same is being lauded as the sign of sense of discipline and dynamic mind, makes us apprehensive as to whether it will ultimately be possible for the present Cominform leadership to come out of this impasse.

It must be made clear in this connection that while we have no difference, whatsoever, with

(Contd. to Page 8)

## In 1948 Comrade Shibdas Ghosh Warned...

of the revolutionary communist leadership through interaction of ideas.

Whereas, it is accepted in the Leninist principle that the general international line of revolution will evolve through the interaction of ideas between the communist parties of different countries developed on the basis of concrete social, political and economic conditions of the different countries in the perspective of the then international political situation, we, on the contrary, have been noticing for a long time that instead of following this dialectical process for evolving the general international line of revolution, a practice and convention of accepting the analysis of the international situation by just one or two leading communist parties as the general international line

reaucratic leadership at the top.

This phenomenon clearly indicates the serious short-comings in the ideological and political field of activities in the world communist movement. The proof of it can be found from the very admission by the different communist parties [reference may be made to the past admission of mistakes by the communist parties of France, Italy, India etc., in a meeting of the Cominform, in the matter of applying the well-known 'People's War theory' on concrete political situations obtaining in those coun-

of the question of the present day ideological struggle. So long, the communists of different countries, mostly stressed on one-sided routine work of organisation without showing any regard to co-ordinating with questions of ideology. On the other hand, these leaders have only exhorted the party workers about their duty to the party, the discipline (which is anything but mechanical) and the need to expand anyhow the party organisation.

But the day of reckoning has, now, come. Now it is being felt more and more that without screening and purges in the

**"The serious short-comings and defects in international communist movement are largely due to mechanical process of thinking of the leadership"**



2

## On Characterisation of the Epoch, Law of Inevitability of Wars etc.

.....in the opinion of the present leaders of the CPSU, particularly to Lenin's proposition about the inevitability of wars in the era of imperialism and about the prospect of preserving lasting peace in the world...though they have not altogether ruled out the law of violent revolution in the capitalist countries, they are emphasising more on the possibility of peaceful realisation of socialist revolution as a general law at present. To show the "fundamental difference" in the characteristic features between imperialism at the time of Lenin and that obtaining at present, they are saying that since the present era is the era of disintegration of imperialism, establishment of socialism and of further advancement and development of socialist countries, it is not possible to realise the exact significance of this epoch by the thesis of Lenin on 'Imperialism, War and Proletarian Revolution'. Hence according to these leaders, the formulations of Lenin on questions of war and peace

and the general law of development of socialist countries have lost their validity. Those who are still clinging to those formulations, in the face of the changed world situations, therefore, are failing to realise the exact significance of the changes in the present international situation and consequently, are over-estimating the strength of imperialism and undermining the strength of the socialist states, the present-day peace movement and of the working class movement going on in all the countries of the globe..... Anyone who correctly understands the materialist dialectical principle that "Quantitative change leads to qualitative change" cannot fail to see that in the long process of development of given phenomenon, unless the phenomenon itself, through the gradual acceleration of quantitative changes, reaches to the nodal point and is qualitatively changed, yielding

place to a new phenomenon qualitatively different from it, the principal characteristic feature of the given phenomenon does not disappear and the internal motive forces that basically determine its principal characteristic feature continue in force, in spite of whatever amount of quantitative and qualitative changes of other contending forces which are moving centering round the basic contradiction within the given phenomenon might have undergone.

So, every Marxist-Leninist must know that every epoch is bound to witness, in the natural process of its development, various significant changes. But notwithstanding these changes, the principal characteristic features of the epoch remain in force till an altogether new epoch emerges on the ashes of the old one...

...So the communists must bear in mind that in the existing changed international situation the possibility of preserving peace and the danger of outbreak of wars are both equally real. It will be an unpardonable mistake to lay unnecessary emphasis on the one and thereby underestimate the other....

[War and Peace, Peaceful Co-existence and Peaceful Transition to Socialism—1959.]

\* \* \*  
...It is one thing and a very good thing too to stress the point that in the changed present day international situation war is not fatalistically inevitable.

laws of political economy as the reflection of objective processes, which take place independently of the will of man.....The law of inevitability of wars in the epoch of imperialism is a law of political economy, which arises from the special political and economic conditions of the epoch. These conditions are mainly, the competition between the different imperialist-capitalist countries for market and the intensification of these antagonistic contradictions in the epoch of imperialism. So long as these conditions will remain, the law of inevitability of wars between capitalist countries will continue in force. Only when these conditions will be replaced by new conditions

### The possibility of preserving peace and the danger of outbreak of war are both equally real

But it is quite a different thing to say that Lenin's thesis about the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries in the epoch of imperialism has become obsolete. Marxism-Leninism regards all laws of science—whether they be laws of natural science or

—both economic as well as political—then and then only the law of inevitability of war will lose its validity, owing to these new conditions.

[Call of the Hour, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, Vol. 1, No. 1 (New series July 1, 1962.)]

3

## ROLE OF RESURGENT NATIONALISM

**"The contradiction between the newly independent bourgeois nationalist countries with imperialism on the one hand and the socialist camp on the other is to be given equal weight as if it is a fifth contradiction"—showed Comrade Shibdas Ghosh fifteen years back**

.....The bourgeoisie of the independent former colonial countries in Asia and Africa is not only reconstructing the national economy of these countries which is further continuously contracting the market of the powerful capitalist countries but also in some cases coming out as competitors to the major capitalist countries in the already contracted world capitalist market.....

.....But we are sorry to note that only the anti-imperialist and anti-war acts and policies of the ruling bourgeoisie of these countries that are objectively helping to maintain world peace are being eulogised and ostentiously displayed and highly commended while no notice is being taken of (1) the fundamental difference between the consistent peaceful policy of the socialist states and the undependable policy of peace pursued by the newly independent capitalist countries, (2) the increasing tendency of fascization and appearance of fascistic characteristics in diverse forms in the state structure and administrative set up of these countries, (3) the developing trend of imperialism and expansionism which in the case of some of these countries is assuming naked form at times and, above all, (4) of the fact that these newly independent capitalist countries are going to play, more and more, the main role as agents of

**world imperialism-capitalism in Asia and Africa in the matter of forcible suppression of the growth and development of socialist revolutionary struggles.**

(War and Peace, Peaceful Co-existence and Peaceful Transition to Socialism—Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, 1959.)

.....The Soviet Union has taken a lop-sided view of the anti-imperialist role of these countries, and has failed to understand the motive that is prompting these countries to play the anti-imperialist role. These newly independent resurgent nationalist countries are essentially trying to build up powerful capitalist economy within their respective countries, but the imperialist powers are standing as a great stumbling block to the realisation of these aspirations. These resurgent nationalist countries are attempting to come out of imperialist subjugation through building up national capitalist economy. The anti-imperialist role of these countries is due to this contradiction existing between the imperialist countries and the resurgent nationalist countries. These countries seek the help of socialist countries so that they may come out of the clutches of the imperialist powers. But since these countries

(Contd. to Page 6)

4

## ON REVOLUTIONARY SIGNIFICANCE OF THE POLICY OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

.....Peace now represents a definite political thought, may be a thought combining diverse opinions but a thought indeed, for checking another world conflagration and maintaining international peace. It is politics in so far as it stands against all attempts for war. So how can the peace partisans in the sphere of culture remain above politics and how can their works be apolitical? **We are to courageously declare that yes, we want to bring politics into culture not with the aim of diverting attention of people but with the purpose of sharpening their consciousness so that they can remain ever-vigilant and firmly determined to actively fight for peace with every means in their power to foil the criminal designs of the instigators of a new war.**

We are not pacifists but peace partisans. The birth and development of a mighty peace movement in our country demand a relentless fight against pacifist illusion; success of the movement cannot be achieved unless the barricade of pacifism is battered to dust. Pacifism is the philosophy sponsored by the bourgeois hirelings; it is aimed at maintaining the present exploitation by appeasing the imperialist aggressors and weakening the revolutionary fervour of oppressed and exploited class. When the aggressors are armed to the teeth and the peace loving people are not even organised against the force of militarism, any philosophy calling upon the people to remain pacifist and practise the virtue of 'endurance' will give the former a free hand in materialising their sinister motive unopposed. Force can be annulled only by force. Pacifism, allows the ruling exploiting class, bent on unleashing a predatory war, to increase and use force against toiling millions unwilling to become cannon-fodder again but actively opposes resistance-struggle of the masses. **Cosmopolitanism, Existentialism.... or whatever may be the name, the aim of all such pacifist philosophy is to weaken the militancy of the mass force, damp its vigilance and get it unaware in the trap of war.** So it is the bounden duty of all peace partisans, particularly those in the cultural front on whom mainly rests the responsibility of educating and mobilising the forces of peace through works of art, literature and philosophy, to bear no illusion about pacifism and lay the class essence of it bare to the people....

(From : To The Peace Cultural Workers, 4th April '52)

.....A Marxist-Leninist always approaches every

question, be it on 'War and Peace' or on 'Peaceful Co-existence of capitalist and socialist systems' or on any other matter, with the sole object of accelerating the process of revolution. So in conducting a serious political movement like the present day peace movement, a communist must always keep it in mind that the purpose of the mighty peace movement is not simply to preserve peace at all costs as bourgeois pacifists consider. If we intend to realise the revolutionary significance of the policy of peaceful co-existence and peace movement, we are to bear some points in mind. At the time of the great Russian revolution the workers and other exploited masses of Russia had to fight not only the Czar and the forces of internal reaction but also the powerful imperialist interventionists, defeat them and maintain and consolidate the power captured through the revolution. The Chinese people, too, had to overthrow not only the Chiang regime but also the military might of the USA. But in the existing changed international situation if the imperialists are compelled to follow the policy of peaceful co-existence and non-intervention in the domestic affairs of other countries by the force of peace movement, it will be easier for the working class and other exploited masses of the people in the capitalist countries and colonies and semi-colonies to overthrow their respective enemies through revolution. The revolutionary significance of the present day peace movement and of the policy of peaceful co-existence, lies precisely in the creation of that very favourable condition in the international situation which makes it possible for the revolutionary forces in the capitalist and colonial and semi-colonial countries to conduct

...Peace movement and the policy of peaceful co-existence should be conducted in such a way as to accelerate the speed of revolutionary movements. Failure to understand that the real significance of the existing changed international situation lies precisely in the birth of these favourable conditions is mainly responsible for lack of correct idea about the

### WHEN ALL

character, possibility and limitation of the present day peace movement. [War and Peace, Peaceful Co-existence and Peaceful Transition to Socialism, 1959]

...We must not forget that communists are fighters for peace and not pacifists. A Marxist-Leninist approaches every issue from the standpoint of necessity of revolution and progress and this makes all the difference between the communist

### Comrade Shibdas Ghosh alone pointed out

revolutionary battles against their respective enemies without foreign intervention and interference. Thus the world wide peace movement or the policy of peaceful co-existence is neither a political manoeuvre nor a subtle device to kill time for war preparations as many pseudo-Marxists think; on the contrary, if correctly understood, each of them is one of the complex revolutionary means to accelerate the course of socialist revolution in metropolitan capitalist countries and national liberation movements in colonies and semi-colonies which in the present situation are part and parcel of world proletarian revolution....

understanding of a new approach to the question of world peace and pacifist illusion. To a revolutionary, even though he considers the preservation of world peace to be of supreme importance in the present-day international situation, peace is not the end in itself, not a self-sufficient entity. So, he is not in favour of any and

"will open the flood-gate

3.

### Role of Resurgent Nationalism

(Contd. from Page 5)

are themselves, building up capitalist economy within their countries they cannot totally depend on the socialist countries because of the fear of working class revolution within these countries and the progressive and revolutionary movements within these countries are mercilessly suppressed.....

.....No one can deny that for containing imperialism, ensuring world peace and strengthening revolutionary movements in colonies, semi-colonies, newly independent countries and metropolitan capitalist countries, the anti-imperialist role of the newly independent resurgent nationalist countries must be taken advantage of by the socialist countries. All sorts of help need to be provided by the socialist countries to these resurgent nationalist countries for protection against imperialist intervention so that these countries can develop their economy and thereby the contradiction within the imperialist camp which is already acute

owing to the crisis of market, may be further sharpened.

(Free translation from a speech of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh—1930)

.....Most of these resurgent nationalist countries of Asia and Africa have since advanced in capitalist development of their national economies. Some of them have already given birth to monopoly finance capital. And naturally, they have already appeared as significant competitors to the traditionally powerful imperialist-capitalist countries in the world capitalist market. The growing accentuation of the contradiction between these resurgent nationalist countries and the powerful imperialist-capitalist countries are symptomatic of the stress and strains in their sharp competition over the share of capitalist market.

Some of these resurgent nationalist countries are themselves showing growing signs of imperialism and expansionism, in some cases open and latent in other cases, coupled with the intensification of class-struggle within these resurgent nationalist countries and fear of revolution of the national bourgeoisie which are

10th Party  
Congress of  
C.P.C. if not a  
reproduction  
CONFIRMS  
our analysis on  
resurgent  
nationalism



## POLICY OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE IS NEITHER A POLITICAL MANOEUVRE NOR A SUBTLE DEVICE TO KILL TIME, BUT IS ONE OF THE COMPLEX REVOLUTIONARY MEANS TO ACCELERATE THE COURSE OF REVOLUTION

every kind of peace or is not opposed to all kinds of war. He is against all unjust wars and aggressive wars of annexation but supports and encourages wars of liberation for the emancipation of the masses of the people from exploiting system. He is, likewise, against pacifism, the idea and acts to purchase peace at any cost but resolutely fights for that

### OTHERS GLORIFIED IT

peace which helps revolution to grow, develop and intensify. [Some Questions on The Way The Cuban Crisis Had Been Solved, Feb. 1963]

...Due to formalistic process of thinking there prevails a confusion in the matter of understanding the relation of the foreign policy of the USSR directed from the state plane with the progra-

of international proletarian revolution supplement each other and are grounded on the common interest of establishing world socialist order. Yet there is a contradiction between the two. The aim of Soviet foreign policy is to 'consolidate the forces of socialism, create further a n d deeper antagonism between the imperialists-capitalists, isolate the less adventurers

in the Imperialist War Camp from the more adventurers, defend and maintain world peace and thereby create objective conditions for the growth, development and success of the world proletarian revolution. The aim of the programme of world proletarian revolution is to provide the general guiding line for successful revolution in different countries. The duty of the communist parties in colonies, semi-

Forum blindly. [On Steps Taken By CPSU Against Stalin, March, 1962]

While practising the policy of peaceful co-existence and trying to develop such co-operation, one should not harbour the illusion that imperialism will change its essential nature and become genuine advocate of peace, peaceful co-existence and international co-operation. The imperialists are speaking of peace and co-operation with the socialist states not because of any basic change in their essential nature but because of the exigency of the situation i.e. superior military might of the socialist camp. If this superiority goes, the

movement and the preservation of world peace, considers peace as a self-sufficient objective and consequently, isolates the question of peace movement and world peace from the task of intensifying anti-imperialist revolutionary movement and struggle, is guilty of preaching pacifism and objectively appeases imperialism. He even goes to the extent of curbing the advance of revolution and progress in dependent and metropolitan countries in his craze for so-called peace. Moreover, he fails to notice that by such actions he makes serious damage not only to the cause of revolution and progress but also to the cause of world peace on the importance of which he so glibly talks. [ibid]

...So the communists must bear in mind that in the existing changed international situation the possibility of preserving peace and the danger of outbreak of wars are both equally real. It will be an unpardonable mistake to lay unnecessary emphasis on the one and thereby underestimate the other. And because of such faulty approach, some communist leaders, in adopting con-

crete steps to preserve world peace, are giving the main stress on steps like negotiations with the imperialist-capitalist countries within and without the UNO, disarmament proposal, peace movement and the policy of peaceful co-existence of the capitalist and socialist states (these are very important steps in the matter of maintaining world peace—there is no doubt about it), while undermining the importance of the tasks of actively supporting and intensifying the national liberation movements in colonies and semi-colonies and the struggles for the establishment of socialism in the metropolitan capitalist countries on which itself mainly depends the prospect of overthrowing imperialism-capitalism and thereby guaranteeing lasting peace in the world. [War and Peace, Peaceful Co-existence and Peaceful Transition to Socialism, 1959]

...For, the ultimate guarantee of world peace lies not in the pledge of the imperialists not to launch war, far less in appeasing them by giving unnecessary concessions to avert war but mainly in the intensification and success of national liberation movements in colonies and semi-colonies and socialist revolution in metropolitan capitalist countries along with the development of world peace movement.

## that 20th Party Congress of C.P.S.U.

time of international proletarian revolution. Most of the Communist parties consider the two as one and the same. This is grossly erroneous. There is no denying that the foreign policy of the USSR and the programme

colonies and metropolitan countries is to creatively apply this general line in their respective countries. It is none of their business to make parrot like repetition of the measures adopted in the foreign policy of the USSR or of the general line of the International Communist

imperialists will lose no opportunity to start a world war.

[Some Questions On The Way The Cuban Crisis Had Been Solved, Feb, 1963]

...Any Marxist-Leninist who loses sight of the revolutionary significance of the present-day peace

## of revisionism"

drawing them closer politically with the ruling circles of the powerful imperialist-capitalist countries.

So, the increasing political akinness of the national bourgeoisie of these resurgent nationalist countries to imperialism as such is no indication of their being satellite to foreign imperialist powers, as their growing antagonism with foreign imperialists for economic reasons is no sign of their progressiveness. These two are different expressions of the same complex contradiction between a developing imperialist country and traditional imperialist countries.

(Free translation from a speech of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, 1960)

....You all know that as far back as in 1959-60, we noted the emergence of the newly independent resurgent nationalist countries as the most significant event in the post-war international situation. We also said that even if anybody objects to characterise the nature of contradiction between the newly independent bourgeois nationalist countries with imperialism on the one hand and the socialist camp on the other as the fifth contradiction. In addition to the four major contradictions, propounded by Lenin, this contradiction must be recognised, as a most significant phenomenon, giving equal weight, as if it is a fifth contradic-

tion which is influencing the aforesaid four major contradictions governing the present day international politics. Because, the contradiction that has appeared round the emergence of these newly independent resurgent nationalist countries cannot be exactly brought under the same category of the contradiction between imperialism versus national liberation struggle. So, failure to correctly ascertain the real nature and realise the importance of this contradiction in influencing the four major contradictions of the world will tantamount to falling prey to dogmatism while handling the four major contradictions propounded by Lenin.

After so many years, after a lapse of fourteen to fifteen years, the Report of the 10th Party Congress of the Chinese Communist Party while analysing the role of Third World has said: "The awakening and the growth of the Third World is a *major event* (italics ours) in the contemporary international relation (here 'contemporary international relation' relates to Four Major Contradictions in my opinion—Shibdas Ghosh).

This, if not an exact reproduction, is very much close to our analysis on this question and confirms our view-points.

(Free translation from a part of the speech of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh on the Report of the 10th Party Congress of the C. P. C.—6.11.73)

Unnecessary and unilateral concession given to imperialism to avert war which objectively tantamounts to appeasement had always inflamed the hunger of imperialism, resulting in newer and fresh demands being advanced by it ultimately leading to the outbreak of more brutal wars of annexation, here and there on the globe. [Some Questions On The Way The Cuban Crisis Had Been Solved, Feb. 1963]

(Contd. from Page 4)

regard to fundamental objective and present political programme of the International Communist Movement, we are of firm opinion that the attitude that the leaders can commit no mistake in conducting ideological struggle and handling organisational matters, or that in case they commit mistakes, any attempt to point them out in the spirit of self-criticism tends to weaken the communist movement as such, is sheer blindness and influenced by bourgeois escapism which is alien to Marxism.

It has been proved that despite its long association with the communist camp and carrying with it the tradition of many historic revolutionary battles to its credit the Communist Party of Yugoslavia under the leadership of Marshal Tito has failed to grasp properly the fundamental tenets of Marxism. So, the record of sufferings and sacrifices in the past alone is no guarantee of correctness in conducting communist movements at present; the approach, the standpoint and the programme have got to be judged on the anvil of experimented truth and fundamental teachings of Marxism, constantly and as far as possible, on every practical issue. This point has found clear expression in the following words of Comrade Stalin: "Without practice theory is sterile and without theory practice is blind". On the one hand, although the call of the present Cominform leadership to consolidate organisational solidarity has evoked quite wide response within the parties, side by side, signs of newer cracks and rifts in the firm solidarity forged through many heroic struggles, are coming to light.....

We would appeal to all communists of the world and especially to those in India who are known as communists to take this criticism of ours as a piece of self-criticism and not just a criticism by the opponents. What we are trying to particularly pin-point before the

communists is that sheer blind faith in the Soviet or Cominform leadership will only weaken it. We have at our disposal the store-house of the experiences of the world proletarian revolutionary movement, we possess the Marxian science of dialectics—these provide us with the means by which we must test the leadership—be it the Soviet or Cominform. It must not be forgotten for a single moment that the individual initiative of each and every communist party forms the rock-bottom foundation of dynamism and effectivity of international communist organisations. The practice of lending continuous blind support to the leadership, with eyes shut, makes

not died out with the burial of Trotskyism; if sufficient vigil is not constantly exercised, newer rifts in the Communist Camp, cannot in the context of present extremely complex political situation, be ruled out.

Not only this; if this non-Marxist mechanical outlook prevailing at present in the matter of ideological questions is not rightly resolved in time, it may, no wonder, in the long run bring about a new phenomenon in the world history when people will witness—even after the establishment of socialist systems in different countries, the communists instead of

is completely alien to Marxism. Long before, we have warned against mechanical process of thinking and mechanical process of organisation, prevailing in the international communist movement.

...What harmful effect is created if mechanisation develops in the thought process of a party? What is particularly wrong with it?

Blind and mechanical support may cause even for a big leader to commit mistake. To follow a leader mechanically means that the party is right, when the leader is right, but it commits mistake when the leader is mistaken.

If there is no struggle or interaction between the thinking and ideas of the leader and the rank and file members,

logic and cannot but adopt in its place, the dialectical methodology. If the party follows, though not professedly but objectively, the policy of mechanical centralism both in the ideological and organisational spheres of movement—the ideological centralism is sure to give birth to authoritarianism on the one hand whereas organisational centralism will lead to the formation of bureaucratic leadership at the top. In the first case, a danger of fanatic bent of mind and blind allegiance to leader or leadership will crop up. In such a situation, the object of all discussions inside the party, i.e. inner-party discussion is virtually reduced to anyhow accepting the decision of the leader without any reservation and not to attain truth.

As a result, the real development of the faculty of thinking inside the party is seriously impeded. When we speak of democratic centralism we thereby mean both the organisational and ideological centralism and do not certainly mean following certain democratic norms only in internal organisational affairs of the party. For long, we have been pointing out that although the ideological and organisational activities of the leadership of the International Communist Movement are basically consistent with Marxist-Leninist principles but they are not free from defects. In the sphere of process of thinking and process of organisation in the international communist movement the symptoms of mechanisation were discernible for a long time. Our old literatures will bear it out that long before, we gave the caution that unless the world communist movement and organisation could be freed from mechanisation, then the Tito incident might not be the last one. History has

(Contd. to Page 9)

## I. "Unless the World Communist movement and organisation could be freed from mechanisation, Tito incident might not be the last one"

it impossible to have an objective appraisal of world situation and adopt a correct programme. The history of the disruptors like Tito and others proves to the hilt, our analysis that the process of thinking and the process of movement in international communist movement have not been free from error. Any attempt to cover up this truth is nothing short of self-deception and the established leaders of the International Communist Movement must have to bear, largely, the responsibility for the present confusion and crisis. So, it is incumbent on every communist worker to judge dispassionately and to be conscious of the past history, present trend and tendencies and future course of communist movement. Disruption in the communist movement has

further cementing the unity between them and making rapid strides for the establishment of world communist society are engaged in open confrontation or even in war.

[Free translation from "Self-criticism of the Communist Camp"—Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, Ganadabi, 15th September, 1948]

\* \* \*

...From the very inception of our party, we have been repeatedly stressing that authoritarianism is incompatible with Marxism. We have all along made severe criticism against authoritarianism. It is true that Marxism does not negate the concept of authority but the very sense of authority which breeds authoritarianism has nothing to do with Marxism; rather, it

then there can be no real development of thinking of either the leader or the rank and file. Absence of the struggle gives birth to bureaucracy. Even, if not desired, mechanisation of thought is bound to crop up in practice if such struggle is avoided inside the party. Mechanical centralism will inevitably lead to the formation of bureaucracy at the top just as the law of mechanics leads to the conception of prime-mover.

In the case of a party also, it cannot acquire comprehensive knowledge if it is guided by formal logic. Mechanical and formal way of analysing things can at best lead one to partial truth. A party which is serious to make a correct analysis must shun the easy, simplified and one-sided method of analysis based on formal



# 1. If the non-Marxist mechanical outlook to ideological questions is not removed—

(Contd. from Page 8)

testified that our apprehension was not unfounded.....

.....Some Communist friends in our country, then doubted whether we were at all communists as we dared to point out these errors and shortcomings of the international communist leadership. It goes without saying, that raising that doubt was entirely pointless. For, we cannot forget for a moment that just as we should pay due weight to the experiences of the international leadership so also we can ill-afford to undermine our own. If the relation between the leaders and the rank and file does not become reciprocal then development becomes absolutely impossible. It is not sufficient only to have the right to judge the leadership but what is more important is to apply this right on every occasion, in practice. For a Marxist party this is vitally important in order to guard against possible mistakes and to keep it on the right track. Here too, it must be clear that while judging or criticising the acts of leadership we must be free from blind emotion and be dispassionate. We must judge freeing ourselves from the influence of all variants of bourgeois philosophy as well as from sense of vulgar individualism. Not only the rank and file members should remain conscious about their dialectical relationship with the leadership but the leadership in its turn should bear responsibility in developing this relationship. Thus the sense of responsibility and the nature of relationship between the leadership and the rank and file are reciprocal. But very often, this teaching of Marxism is found missing. It is a queer experience that certain workers of the Communist Party of India often argue like this; "Oh, you are criticising the Cominform? So you don't

abide by it? Then how can you be a communist?" Such a type of logic has nothing to do with dialectics and is a typical product of formal logic. Such an attitude to leadership can make a leader, this moment, a demi-god and in the very next moment, denigrate him to ground, very easily. Both these acts although seemingly opposite are nothing but the product of the same formalistic approach. This defect of formalism in the International Communist Movement was pointed out by us long ago, particularly regarding the role of leadership of the Party and the attitude to be taken on it. Our workers, particularly the old workers know it very well that we pointed out the mistaken analysis of CPSU on the question of Germany and China, long before. But at that time no other party in the International Communist Camp did come forward to point out this mistake.

(Free translation from the speech of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, delivered at the School of Politics held on and from 18th to 20th May, 1956 on the report of the 20th Congress of the CPSU).

## On the question of leading party

The term "leading communist party" has created a good deal of confusion; particularly the non-dialectical understanding of the leading role and obligation of the leading communist parties. There is nothing objectionable in the idea of the leading communist party provided it does not presuppose an unchangeable permanent leadership of a particular communist party on each and every issue that confronts the world communist movement. So accepting a particular party in a particular historical phase as the leading communist party does in no way mean blind obedience

to that party and blind acceptance of all its stands as correct. It, on the contrary, presupposes uninterrupted struggle and interaction of ideas between the leading communist party and other communist parties, which is the only way to ensure the dialectical process indispensable for the growth and operation of collective leadership. The idea of the leading communist party does not even contradict the position that both on general line and on a particular issue the correct analysis may be advanced by any small party other than the leading party, which, being the correct expression of collective leadership should be accepted by all other communist parties. The presentation of the correct line by another party either on international situation or on a particular issue does not, of course, mean that the leading communist party is no longer the leading party or that the other party has become the leading party. Because, the position of a party as the leading communist party is dependent on so many other conditions....[An Appeal to the leaders of the International Communist Movement, Sept. 1963]

....As in the past, Stalin was blindly raised to the 'level of demi-god' so also at present he is blindly depicted as a 'satan' responsible personally for all the ills from which the communist movement suffered in his time. As the International Communist leadership headed by the CPSU and Stalin was considered infallible and above criticism and any and every difference with the decision of the CPSU

was condemned as anti-communism, anti-proletarian internationalism so also at present the leadership of Khrushchev is considered infallible and above criticism and to differ with the decisions of the CPSU under the leadership of Khrushchev is being branded as anti-Sovietism, anti-proletarian internationalism. Then where is the difference in approach, outlook and process of thinking? The same blind sense of authority, the same non-dialectical methodology in the process of thinking and process of movement, the same formalistic understanding of the relationship between different communist parties which during the period of Stalin's leadership were responsible for the growth and development of the cult of the individual in general and Stalin-cult in particular are still at work....

## On lowering of the ideological standard

...But what after all led to these mistakes? What made different communist parties confuse the dialectical understanding of the sense of authority with authoritarianism? Why could not they detect the practice of the centralism based on formal democracy in place of democratic centralism? How could they give up the dialectical principle of 'unity-struggle-unity' and accept instead the formal understanding of unity between different communist parties?

Why did they confuse the idea of leading Communist party with the idea of an unchangeable permanent leadership of the leading Communist party on each and every issue? In our opinion all these mistakes were the

result of considerable amount of lowering of the general standard of consciousness of the Communists at large. It is true that in the post-Lenin period the communist movements in colonies, semi-colonies and metropolitan countries had tremendously developed organisationally. But this development by itself does not prove that the level of ideological consciousness of the Communists also had risen at a rate commensurate with that of the organisational development of the communist movement. In fact, it did not rise the above-mentioned mistakes are definite proof of it. That such a lowering of ideological level can take place in spite of organisational development of the Communist movement is no new phenomenon. Lenin himself had to stress on this apparently contradictory position in his life-time. The lowering of the general standard of consciousness of the Communists was, according to us, mainly due to two factors. Firstly, the philosophical development of Marxism-Leninism which ought to have been made in the face of multiplicity of newer problems of life and class-struggles and in keeping with the spectacular progress of natural sciences that marked the post-Lenin period was not made. There might be so many reasons for this deficiency but it is, no doubt, a fact, the truth of which can be established by one simple example. Nobody will, perhaps, deny that at present the phenomenon of individualism and the bourgeois sense of liberty are, in the ideological sphere, stiff obstacles in metropolitan countries in the path of development

(Contd. to Page 10)

—the communists instead of cementing unity may be found engaged in open confrontation and war



5

## On the Question of PEACEFUL TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM

.....Since the 20th Congress of the CPSU it is being propagated through the speeches and writings of the leaders of the CPSU, that the possibility for peaceful realization of socialist revolution in a number of capitalist countries has become an objective reality in the present favourable international situation. Elucidating on this point Khrushchev said: "In these circumstances the working class, by rallying around itself the toiling peasantry, the intelligentsia, all patriotic forces and resolutely repulsing the opportunist elements who are incapable of giving up the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, is in a position to defeat the reactionary forces opposed to the popular interest, to capture a stable majority in parliament and transform the latter from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of people's will." These leaders though upto now have not altogether discarded the law of violent revolution yet are giving daily, more and more emphasis on the possibility of peaceful realization of socialist revolution in the capitalist countries as a general rule in the changed international situation. This view is no doubt creating dangerous confusion in the sphere of ideological struggles by the communists and has already given a fillip to the existing revisionist tendencies.

.....These theorists are failing to understand that peace over the forces of war and many spectacular notwithstanding the victories to the credit of the superiority of the forces of the former, the world situ-

ation has not changed to that stage when the capitalist class being afraid of the socialist countries does not dare to forcibly crush the revolutionary struggles in its own country. There is not a single instance in history that can prove our above statement to be incorrect; rather, history furnishes us with innumerable instances of ordinary movements by the people based on very modest economic and democratic demands being ruthlessly suppressed in the typically fascistic fashion by the capitalists. Even in countries with long parliamentary tradition parliamentary democratic rights and privileges are being gradually curtailed. Even to the bourgeoisie, parliament is fast losing its utility.

Fascism is manifesting itself in diverse forms more markedly in the state structure, and administrative set up of all capitalist countries developed or backward. In the face of this stern reality it is impossible for any Marxist-Leninist to advocate the theory of peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism, unless he is thoroughly overwhelmed by bourgeois humanist illusions.

.....Whether in the changed international situation now, peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism is possible or not is a debatable question. We do not consider it possible. But even if it is assumed that peaceful realisation is possible, the theory of establishing socialism peacefully by "transforming parliament from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of people's will" is philistine and in no way compatible with Marxism-Leninism. Parliament developed in a particular historical phase in the

**The theory of transforming Parliament as 'instrument of people's will' is downright revisionism**

development of production as the superstructure of a given economic basis to serve the interests of a definite class as its political form of administration; had these theorists taken the trouble of understanding it, they would have understood that proletarian democracy, whatever be its form according to the objective conditions obtaining in different countries, is fundamentally different in character from bourgeois democracy (all kinds of bourgeois institutions) and hence, the political institution of the one cannot serve as the political institution of the

(Contd. to Page 11)

### I. "When we speak of democratic centralism we thereby mean both the organisational and ideological centralism and not merely following certain democratic

(Contd. from Page 9)

of class struggles. The situation calls for a critical discussion of the sense of humanist moral values vis-a-vis proletarian moral values.

But not a single book that can claim to have dealt with the problem authoritatively and comprehensively had been published in the post-Lenin period. Secondly, like the proverbial one-eyed deer the communist leaders in general, to a very large extent, neglected the responsible task of conducting ideological struggles inside the party to whip up the ideological standard of thousands and thousands of young communists who were dragged into the vortex of communist movements and kept themselves busy mostly in organisational activities. Complacent at the rapid and enormous growth and development of the communist movement, the leaders of the Communist Party of

### norms in internal organisational matters"

India even developed an antipathy against theory. All what they demanded of the rank and file were the loyalty of the latter to the party and blind discharge of practical duties. We have no direct knowledge of the conditions that prevail in other countries; but from what we have seen in India and in analysing the cause of the mistakes mentioned before, we feel that the same sense of complacency at the organisational development of the communist movement and the same tendency of deprecating critical attitude to theory and of giving unilateral stress on loyalty of the members of the party and to their practical work were at work in every country. As a result of this neglect of ideological struggles, the lowering of standard of consciousness has been so great in our country that even the standard of Lenin's time is hardly to

be noticed, not to speak of the standard of consciousness necessary to cope with multiplicity of newer and newer problems that confront life and its environment to-day. It should, better be admitted that much of the growth and development of the present-day communist movement owe its origin to the period of decay of imperialism obtaining at present, to the humanistic appeal to common men of anti-imperialist struggles in colonies and semi-colonies, to the liberal sentiment against capitalist exploitation of peoples in metropolitan countries and to the superiority of Socialist System over capitalism.....

..... Did not Lenin give hearing even to his class-enemies? To our sorrow, we find that the Leninist quality of learning from all and the earnestness for learning are wanting to a

degree now. In this connection we like to add further that, contrary to the living spirit of Marxism-Leninism, Communists also have developed the peculiarly bourgeois habit of judging the merit of a case not on the basis of correctness and justness of the stand but on consideration of the organisational strength at the back of the case. Had such a stand been encouraged by Lenin, the Spartacus group in Germany would not have received the unstinted support it got from Lenin against the powerful Social Democratic Party of Germany. To eradicate the cult of the individual from the World Communist Movement the role of the CPSU as the leading communist party should not be understood as that the leadership of the World Communist Movement in all cases must invariably

lie with the CPSU; the formalistic conclusion that to differ with the CPSU is to renunciate internationalism must be replaced by the dialectical understanding of the relationship between different communist parties based on the dialectical principle of unity - struggle - unity which presupposes struggles and interaction of ideas with the CPSU expressly for the purpose of strengthening the collective leadership of the international communist forum. Frankly speaking, we do not find any sign of this dialectical approach.

(On Steps Taken By CPSU Against Stalin—March, 1962).



6

## The Cult of the Individual

...It is our study that during the period of Stalin's leadership Marxist-Leninist understanding of the sense of authority was confused with authoritarianism. This confusion has, in the ideological sphere, implanted the seed of the cult of the individual...

...As an integral part of the world communist force, Socialist Unity Centre of India cannot remain an idle spectator to the serious ideological crisis that confronts the world communist movement today, centring round the relative appreciation of values of Stalin and the measures adopted by the CPSU under the guidance of Khrushchev to fight out the cult of the individual in general and Stalin-cult in particular. In this respect our party does not think it correct to support the one and oppose the other of the views... A formalistic, dogmatic and mechanical approach to the problem will not mend matters; a critical analysis is essentially needed...

...It goes without saying that the cult of the individual is alien to the

Marxist-Leninist concept of collective leadership. It is also admitted that in the later part of Stalin's life this non-Marxist cult grew, developed and dominated in the party-life. It is equally true that it has done incalculable harm to the communist movement. There can be no disagreement with Khrushchev and other leaders of the CPSU in so far as these points are concerned; but at the same time, we cannot but say that no serious attempt from any quarter has yet been made to bring to light the root cause of the cult of the individual and fathom the pernicious effects

### Marxist-Leninist understanding of the sense of authority was confused with authoritarianism

of it on the communist movement...

(From the speech of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, addressed to School of Politics, held on and from 18th to 20th May '56.)

...It is none of our business to fight Stalin the man; we are concerned with the uphill task as to how we, the communists, can remove the root cause that gave birth to and nurtured the cult of the

individual in general and Stalin-cult in particular—an obnoxious idea and practice which has landed the communist movement into present ideological confusion and crisis. The proper approach to the problem should, therefore, be not from the point of view of fighting Stalin, the man, but with the avowed aim of eradicating the cause of the cult of the individual from the communist movement...

...In the absence of struggles and 'discussion in dialogue' in party bodies democratic centralism is bound to degenerate, objectively, into practice

directives for the latter to carry them out blindly and mechanically. And even when a discussion takes place between the leaders and the rank and file, it is done not as a means to ensure 'discussion in dialogue' in party bodies but to understand the point of view of the leaders. The presence of a powerful personality in the party under these circumstances fosters the growth and development of the cult of the individual centring round that personality, while the absence of any such personality leads to formation of group inside the party; but all the same bureaucracy exists and operates from the top in both the

Marxist-Leninist concept of collective leadership. In our view mechanical understanding of the sense of authority coupled with the presence of the powerful personality of Stalin was responsible for the growth and development of the cult of the individual in general and Stalin-cult in particular...

...Our appeal to the present international communist leadership is that these defects and short-comings of Stalin's time have to be overcome. Let a correct process be adopted towards that end. In the absence of that process and without removing the root cause of and the conditions that gave birth to the cult of the individual, it is naive to expect to re-establish the Leninist principle and practice of collective leadership. All other attempts are sure to instal in place of Stalin-cult, another equally obnoxious cult, may be, the Central Committee cult, or the leading Communist Party cult or even Khrushchev cult. No serious Communist can remain indifferent to this possible danger.

(On Steps Taken By CPSU Against Stalin—October 1962.)

(Contd. from Page 10) other. Parliament which is the superstructure of capitalist economy, the basis of capitalist society, cannot serve as the superstructure of socialist society. It not only cannot serve as superstructure of socialist economy, the basis of socialist society, but also is bound to obstruct the growth and development of the basis of socialist society. Thus elimination of the superstructure of the old basis is also an important condition for the growth and development of the new basis. To a Marxist-Leninist, peaceful realisation of socialist revolution in a capitalist country, if at all it becomes possible, means peaceful capture of power by the working class, the bourgeoisie offering no resistance and peaceful destruction of the bourgeois state machine

### 5. Parliament being the Superstructure of Capitalist Economy not only fails to serve as superstructure of Socialist Society, but also is bound to obstruct the growth and development of Socialism

and establishment in its place a new type of state, the proletarian state. It does not mean peaceful transformation of the bourgeois state into a proletarian state through reforms, which can never be done. It also means the peaceful dissolution of parliament and replacing it by the worker's democratic political institution and not peaceful transformation of parliament into an instrument of people's will which also cannot be done.

(War and Peace, Peaceful Co-existence and Peaceful Transition to Socialism—1959).

...If it is possible to "transform parliament, an organ of bourgeois demo-

cracy, into a genuine instrument of the people's will," it is equally possible to transform a bourgeois state into a proletarian state, a bourgeois party into a proletarian party, soon and so forth. This is no Marxism-Leninism. It is vulgarisation of Marxism-Leninism par excellence. (Call of the Hour, July 1, 1962.)

...Every state machine is closely linked up with a particular phase of history in the development of production. It is a class instrument of coercion. The modern state machine has its own characteristic features and its tuning and make-up is such that all its

three organs always function as a composite whole and a centralised one; and each of them is designed to serve the political purpose of a definite class. The operator of a machine cannot perform any other work by that machine other than the work for which the machine was solely designed. As for example, a weaving machine can produce only cotton goods and different kinds of cloths. If he is a highly skilled and efficient weaver then he will produce bigger amount and better quality at a shorter time. If the worker is inefficient and less skilled, he will cause many complications, he will take more time, will produce lesser

quantity and that too, of bad quality. Similarly the Government, the operator, with all the efficiency and skill at its command, with a capitalist state machine cannot do, in the main, anything else other than coercing the people in the interest of capitalist exploitation. It makes fundamentally no difference whether the coercion and exploitation are made in a cruel, in a crude, in a blunt way or they are done in a subtle and cunning way with a sweet coating or by applying some balm to make the pain of coercion and exploitation endurable. A government coerces and exploits with a most rough and dictatorial attitude while the other coaxes the people while coercing and exploiting, with a p p l e s, grapes and butter. But none the less, all of them (Contd. to Page 14)



7

## On the Question of Unity in International Communist Movement

.....It is our apprehension that the serious ideological confusion prevailing at present in the Communist movement, if not rightly resolved in time, may, in the long run, bring about a new phenomenon in world history, when people will witness that Communists of different countries, instead of further cementing the unity between them and making rapid strides for the establishment of World Communist Society, are in direct confrontation with each other.

(On Steps taken by CPSU against Stalin —March '62.)

There is no denying that serious differences on a number of ideological and organisational questions have developed within the international Communist Movement, especially between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communist Party. (An Appeal to Leaders of the International Communist Movement, September, 1963.)

.....There cannot be two opinions as to the importance of the questions involved in the present ideological differences within the world communist camp. They cover a wide field of ideology and principle, relate to communist approach to and attitude towards the burning problems of contemporary world and include the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle by the exploited masses of the peoples of the whole world for emancipation from all sorts of exploitation of man by man. For the successful conduction of this revolutionary struggle, the questions are to be correctly tackled and the differences resolved without any further delay. But though we are fully aware of the necessity of resolving the ideological differences between the different communist parties and not prepared to minimise the importance a whit yet we feel that the resolution of the differences of this nature will take a long time. In fact without an intensive ideological struggle and painstaking education and persuasion, which requires a considerable period of time, the ideological differences cannot be correctly resolved too. But what cannot wait, so to say, for a single day more is the end of the bitterness that has developed, of late, in the mutual relationship between the different communist parties centring round the ideological differences in the communist camp, bitterness of so much intensity that it has adversely affected not only the relation between the different communist parties but also that between the socialist states. Whatever may be the ideological differences, no serious communist can do anything that has the effect of

disrupting the unity of the world proletariat and the international communist movement, weakening the consolidation and solidarity of the Socialist Camp comprising the different socialist states and creating obstacles in the path of presenting a united face by the socialist states against imperialists, their common enemy.

The maintenance of the unity of the working class and the International Communist Movement and of the solidarity of the Socialist Camp is now of paramount importance. All other issues are subordinated to it. Hence, is there any earthly reason that there should be invariably bitterness and animosity between different communist parties affecting the very unity of the communist movement since they are engaged in bitter struggle to resolve the ideological differences? Unity of the working class and the International Communist Movement, solidarity of the Socialist Camp and united movement, by the Socialist states against the imperialists—they have got to be ensured without any further delay, serious ideological differences between the communist parties notwithstanding.

.....First of all, the resolution of so serious ideological differences as the present ones are, requires a strict adherence to the Leninist code of conduct and maintenance of proper relationship between the communist parties that can alone ensure the suitable atmosphere necessary for conducting an ideological struggle. But unfortunately, that relationship is conspicuous by its absence now and, hence, the proper atmosphere is lacking. Some comrades may disagree with us but we still feel that the bitterness, that has developed and is increasing with the passage of time on account of the ideological differences, is mainly due to the lowering of the standard of ideological consciousness of the communists, not excluding some of the present leaders of the International Communist Movement. Otherwise, there is no earthly reason why ideological differences between the different communist parties, so long as they consider their respective opponents as brother communist parties, should adversely affect their mutual relationship and that between the socialist states.

The purpose of conducting an ideological struggle is always to really strengthen the unity ideologically, politically, organisationally and in action.

It is, however, no easy matter to achieve this unity on questions of ideology and principle, by reforming others' ideology and correcting others' long held principles, viewpoints and prejudices. Attempts to resolve ideological differences between the different communist parties by organisational methods like, breach of diplomatic relation between the socialist states, withdrawal of promised economic aid, revocation of trade relation, etc. are bound to fail in bringing the unity. Because, this method of bullying the opponent to submission, even if it succeeds in a few cases, can, at best, achieve superficial unity and not conscious, voluntary unity, based on unity in ideology, will and action, which an ideological struggle aims at achieving. Real unity can only be achieved

through the painstaking process of education and persuasion of the erring comrades, "through the various kinds of complicated struggles and through a considerable period of education, struggle and practice in revolution". Persuasion presupposes proper psychological treatment of the person whose erroneous ideology and principle are sought to be corrected, choice of appropriate time and renunciation of personal sentiment, likes or dislikes on the part of him who intends to reform others. To avoid this path of painstaking education and persuasion and make haste to anyhow resolve the present ideological differences even sacrificing principle, will end in either virtual rift in the World Communist Camp or what we may call history repeating itself, viz. that the ideological differences will be patched up and compromises made on the basis of some via media formula, just to bypass the differences and present a united face to the world at large, leaving the grounds of differences still alive. Such compromises on questions of ideology and principle only worsen the condition as had been done in 1957 Declaration and 1960 Statement. The present situation in the World Communist Camp testifies to the truth of such worsening of condition.

It is now known to all that serious ideological differences on some major questions of ideology and principle between the different communist parties cropped up at the time of the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But in place of conducting a principled struggle and thrashing out all outstanding ideological differences, the representatives of the different communist parties, in the meeting at Moscow in 1957, bypassed the ideological differences, patched them up and, even sacrificing principles, adopted an apparently united stand in the form of the Declaration of 1957, which under cover of a seeming unity, was actually nothing but a queer admixture of contradictory views on ideological questions of fundamental nature. ....Again these differences were not thoroughly thrashed out and a definite line was not adopted, when the representatives of the eightyone communist and workers' parties met in Moscow in 1960. The Statement of 1960, like the previous document, the Declaration of 1957, in place of presenting a definite clear cut line to guide the International Communist Movement, became once again a punch of two fundamentally different lines, thus keeping the door open to each to propagate its own line of thought. Such

(Contd. to Page 13)

**Serious ideological differences notwithstanding unity of the Communist Movement against imperialism, the common enemy, is of paramount importance**



(Contd. from Page 12)

punches, unprincipled compromises on questions of ideology, always remain the breeding ground of more violent future differences. As a result, compared to 1957, in spite of pious wishes the sphere of differences has extended, the tone of mutual criticism has hardened, the temper has been frayed, all tending towards a violent show down between the disputant parties. Had the ideological differences been correctly resolved at the initial stage, when they were first detected, instead of patching them up by unprincipled compromises, International Communist Movement would have been saved from the set-back which the present ideological differences between the powerful communist parties have brought upon it.

It must not be forgotten that in case of ideological differences concerning questions of principle, there can be no middle line, no compromise. The work must be based on either this or that principle. The middle line always muddles up the whole thing and worsens the situation. Attempts to anyhow resolve the present ideological differences immediately, as is expressed in the viewpoint of the CPSU and some other parties, even at the cost of principle, by patching up the differences and adopting a via media, as in the past, will further complicate the issues and keep alive the grounds of ideological differences only to make it worse in future. So, let the ideological differences be kept open for the present and let ideological struggles be conducted through polemical discussions, bipartite meetings and conferences of the different communist parties, maintaining communist code of conduct and decorum, with a view to create proper atmosphere necessary for conducting correctly the ideological struggle and help each other to reach real unity in ideology, principle, organisation and action....

Ideological differences within the world communist camp are no new phenomena also. Nor can their future occurrence be absolutely ruled out. There had been ideological differences between the communist parties in the past and it goes without saying that in future also, even after the present differences would be correctly resolved, there will crop up fresh new differences. In the present historical epoch, when the national form of existence has not outlived itself, when the communist parties of different countries are maintaining separate existence, there is every likelihood of differences being cropped up between them on matter of approach to different world issues because of the difference in experience gained by the different communist parties in course of the revolutionary struggle conducted by them in their respective national spheres. Such differences are not unnatural and there is nothing for the communists to be perturbed over such differences. Within an individual communist party also differences even on matter of ideology and principle among its members may take place. So long as the inner-party struggle is conducted on the basis of education and persuasion to resolve the differences and strengthen unity of the party ideologically, politically, organisationally and in action, there is no harm. And unless and until the conclusion is finally reached

that ideological rapprochement is no more possible, the inner party struggle should not disturb the unity of the party and united action against the enemy. If any inner-party struggle deepens the differences within the party, if it intensifies disunity and adversely affects united action against the enemy (unless it is concluded that ideological rapprochement between the disputants is an impossibility), then it is to be realised that the struggle is being conducted without principle or that there is lack of understanding of the principle that should govern the communists in the conduction of an ideological struggle or that there is serious lacking in the understanding of communist ethics. What has been said here about inner-party struggle within an individual communist party applies with equal force to the ideological struggle which the different communist parties in the World Communist Camp conduct. Ideological struggle between the communist parties, if conducted principally, due regard being given to the object of such struggle and to the principle that governs the condition of such struggle has no reason to create strained relation between the communist parties and between the socialist states, resulting in the weakening of the working class and the International Communist Movement, the weakening of the solidarity of the Socialist Camp and the creation of hurdles in the path of united action

## 7. The aim of ideological struggle is to educate the rank and file, the class and the masses

### It should therefore be open polemical discussion

by the socialist states against the common enemy, the imperialists.....

(On Steps Taken by CPSU Against Stalin—March '62.)

.....The aim of ideological struggle is to educate. Education does not mean education of the leaders alone. It includes education of the rank and file, the class and the masses. Closed door secret meetings of the top leaders of the communist parties on ideological differences between them deprive the ordinary members of the parties, the class and the masses of the peoples of the opportunity of directly participating in the ideological struggle and thereby educating themselves. Besides, such secret meetings smack of conspiratorial movements which neither communism nor communist education is. Open polemical discussion, on the other hand, brings in bold relief the ideological differences and helps them to be resolved. Furthermore, it minimizes the scope of wrong apprehension and misgivings in mass mind and possibility of distorting the opponents' views and shifting one's own stand constantly without public admission of mistakes which secret meetings are liable to. For, in an open polemical discussion the respective views of the parties participating in it do not remain confined among the leaders of the parties alone but get world-

wide publicity which makes it very difficult for one to distort other's views and change one's own stand surreptitiously.

And even if the views of the opponents are distorted or one's own stand conveniently changed, without admitting in public, the mistakes, others can easily detect them. Then again since the discussion is open, ordinary members of the parties, the class and the masses are actively involved in the ideological struggle and get the opportunity of judging the correctness or otherwise of the respective views of the different communist parties, educating themselves accordingly and of even exercising pressure on the leaders to rectify themselves. The participating parties too get, in an open polemical discussion on ideological differences, the opportunity of learning from the class and the masses. **Thus an open polemical discussion on questions of ideology and principle if conducted principally may serve as an antidote to party fanaticism and blindness to leaders.** So, open polemical discussion as such cannot be held responsible, as some comrades allege, for the set-back in mutual relationship between the different communist parties and between the socialist states that has, of late, taken place, centring round the present ideological differences between them.....

.....The term "leading communist party" has created a good deal of confusion; particularly the non-dialectical understanding of the leading role and obligation of the leading communist parties.....

.....They and they alone, suffer from formalism and lack proper understanding of the complex dialectical process involved in the maintenance of unity between the different communist parties, take any difference with any decision of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as anti-Sovietism and renunciation of Proletarian Internationalism. These persons made the mistake of confusing every contradiction as antagonism and forget that collective leadership in the International Communist Movement grows and operates only through the dialectical process of struggle and interaction of ideas between the different communist parties and not through renunciation of struggle. **The unity between the communist parties is not based on formalistic mechanical relation; the relation between them, on the contrary, is governed by the dialectical principle of 'unity-struggle-unity' on the basis of new understanding of the values of life and cemented by the common objective of World Proletarian Revolution and establishment of World Communist Society.....**

.....The unity in the World Communist Camp is based on struggle and interaction of ideas between the different communist parties. Ideological campaign by a communist party among the rank and file of other communist parties through books and literature is only one of the various methods of conducting this struggle and helping interaction of ideas. To deny to the opponents this right of direct ideological approach to the ordinary members of one's own party and prevent, by all means, the circulation of the opponent's views on any plea—be it on the plea of minimizing tension between the

(Contd. to Page 14)



(Contd from Page 13)

peoples of the socialist countries or the plea of creating proper atmosphere conducive to early solution of ideological differences or any other plea is an attempt to silence discussion.

It should be realised that, whatever may be the temporary gains of these leaders for the present, this appeal to blindness and party fanaticism is sure to create not one but several Frankensteins in the World Communist Movement which will cause incalculable damage to Communism itself. The damage already done, far outweighs the temporary gains of these leaders. These present leaders will, perhaps, not be there to see the damage caused by them to Communism, by fanning

**7. In case of ideological differences concerning questions of principle, unprincipled compromise instead of resolving the issues breeds further complication and open rift**

party fanaticism openly and narrow national sentiment subtly in the mind of the ordinary members of their parties and the peoples of their countries, but their legacy will keep on weighing like an alp for decades, on the workers and the masses of the peoples in all countries of the globe, who have got to rise above national isolation, narrow national sentiment and party fanaticism to secure the establishment of the World Communist Society.

.....All restrictions on the conduction of the present ideological struggle should be immediately withdrawn and every opportunity for a free and fair ideological campaign among the members of the fraternal communist parties should be ungrudgingly given, subject to the only proviso that

the communist code of conduct and decorum that govern inner-party struggle within an individual communist party, should be strictly adhered to in this case also .....

.....Not to admit one's mistakes openly but, at the same time, constantly shifting from the original stand in the face of the opponents' arguments in the course of an ideological struggle means to suffer from egoism and lack of modesty. Egoism and lack of modesty are stumbling blocks in the way of correct resolution of ideological differences between the different communist parties....

..... So, let the ideological differences be kept open for the present and ideological struggle conducted on the above mentioned basis, maintaining proper decorum. But the strain in the relationship between the communist parties as also between the socialist states, that has cropped up during the present ideological struggle, has got to be immediately removed and normal healthy relationship re-established. It is the imperative duty of every communist to work to that end. And for that purpose we suggest that the following measures should be immediately adopted, regardless of how wide the ideological differences between the communist parties are and how trenchantly this struggle to resolve those differences is conducted.

(1) Taking advantage of its advantageous position vis-a-vis the difficulties of others, no communist party or socialist state should interfere in the internal organisational and administrative affairs of other parties or socialist states directly or indirectly.

(2) Every communist party should have the right to carry on open ideological struggle among the members of all other fraternal communist parties on the exclusive question of ideology and principle involved in the present ideological differences between them.

(3) In no case should any communist party indulge in any act which has the

effect of disrupting the unity of the working class and the International Communist Movement.

(4) No communist party or socialist state should take any step which will strain the normal diplomatic relation between the socialist states. Where there has been breach of such relation, the relation should be re-established forthwith.

(5) No socialist state should withhold promised economic aid or change trade relation, to the disadvantage of any other socialist state. Where the trade relation and economic co-operation between the socialist states have been adversely affected, the relation and co-operation should be normalised immediately and promised economic aid given.

(6) No communist party or socialist state should do anything that will weaken the solidarity of the Socialist Camp. The socialist states should present a united face against the imperialists on all issues pertaining to revolutionary struggle by the peoples against imperialism-capitalism.

We appeal to the leaders of the World Communist Movement to exert themselves whole-heartedly so as to restore a healthy relation between the different communist parties and between the socialist states. Let them not, by hasty steps, weaken the mighty edifice of proletarian internationalism and socialism which legions of workers, peasants and other exploited masses of the peoples of the whole world have built up at the cost of their blood and push back the advance of the revolutionary struggles by several decades.

Long live proletarian

internationalism !

Long live the unity of the

working class !

[An Appeal to the Leaders of the International Communist Movement, Sept., 1963]

(Contd. from Page 11)

do exploit and coerce for preserving the interest of the existing capitalist system. Therefore, if the production and life of our country are to be freed from the yoke of capitalist exploitation and oppression, there is no other way but to overthrow the capitalist state machine through revolution.

(From his Speech on the 27th anniversary—24th April '75, Proletarian Era, 7th June, 1975)

.....Not to view a state along with all its organs viz. the military, police and bureaucracy as a particular system of class

## 5. The recent trend of implanting revolution with the help of a section of national bourgeoisie, bureaucracy and military manifests Trotskite conspiratorial bent of mind

instrument and any attempt to replace this system for capture of power without recourse to insurrection involving the masses but simply by removing certain high officials of the government—do they not fall under the category of anti-Marxist-Leninist conspiratorial activity of the upper stratum of the society? This is the main question.

[“Indonesia—an analysis in the background of the abortive coup of 30th September”—Published in Ganadabi, June, 1966—based on the thought of Com.

Shibdas Ghosh].

.....The fanciful and so-called theory of National Democratic Revolution of the present Soviet revisionist leadership has practically reduced Leninist theory of revolution to a theory of coup-d'etat which is anything but revolution.

...After the exposure of real face of social democratic forces in Europe, social democracy was working as a definite trend in the communist movement for a long time. Modern revisionism is nothing but an outward manifestation of that social

democratic trend in the communist movement..... After its virtual death as a force to reckon with in the political movement, Trotskyism is also working as another trend or bent of mind in the communist movement. The theory of formation of National Democratic Governments along with the national bourgeoisie of different capitalist countries as a means to “Non-capitalist and Peaceful” transition to socialism is nothing but a peculiar fusion of these two trends of social democracy and Trotskyism in commu-

nist movement. As the theory of the present Soviet revisionist leadership to “transform Parliament as an instrument of people's will” is a downright expression of the trend of unadulterated social democracy, so also the theory of implanting revolution by destroying the old Parliamentary set up by combining with the military, bureaucracy and the national bourgeoisie in different capitalist countries is a manifestation of the conspiratorial bent of mind of Trotskyism.

[From his speech addressed to the party workers after the debacle in Indonesia.]